Thornebrooke Elementary

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Thornebrooke Elementary

601 THORNEBROOKE DR, Ocoee, FL 34761

https://thornebrookees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Korey Bawden

Start Date for this Principal: 1/15/2008

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Thornebrooke Elementary

601 THORNEBROOKE DR, Ocoee, FL 34761

https://thornebrookees.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	32%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Daniels, Christopher	Principal	*The entire operation of the school *Instructional coach and supervision *Assistance to all staff *Instructional Staff Evaluations *Data collection and analysis *School Improvement Plan (SIP) *Assessments *School Budget *Security and safety -Co-lead *School Threat Assessment Team *School liaison for PTO and SAC *Master Schedule *MTSS *Professional Development *DPLC lead *Calendar/Event approval *Internal money reimbursement *DCF- Co-Contact *Other duties as assigned by the Area Superintendent
Honis, Susan	Instructional Coach	*Principal's Designee in the absence of the principal and Asst. Principal *Testing Coordinator *Instructional coach and supervision *Marzano Coaching support and Evaluations *Data collection and analysis *MTSS Support *OCPS coach meetings *Provide assistance to teachers in the areas of curriculum, instruction and assessment *Teacher Lead Mentor *Professional Development *Serves on School Advisory Council *School Improvement Plan (SIP) *DPLC Member *Other duties as assigned by the Principal
Dobson, Ann	Instructional Media	*Operation of the Media Center *Website and Public Relations *Barracuda Bytes/Newsletter *PIE co-coordinator *Instructional Technology *Accelerated Reader *Media materials *Textbook/instructional materials Manager *Instructional media assistance *Fixed Assets Property Manager *Teach-In *Other duties as assigned by the principal

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Goodman, Felecia	Assistant Principal	*Principal's designee *Assist in the entire operation of the school *School discipline *School Threat Assessment Team *Skyward *Buses *SAC representative *Approve classified and instruct. leave forms *Team PLC support *DCF-Co Contact *Maintenance- work orders *Marzano/I-Observation *PIE/Partners in Ed co-coordinator *Other duties as assigned by principal
Green, Leslee	Other	*Coordinate ESE compliance *Assists with the inclusion of ESE students *Assist in scheduling of ESE students, ESE teachers, and paraprofessionals *MTSS team *Data collection and analysis *Other duties as assigned by the principal
Miller, Jane	School Counselor	*Conducts individual, group and crisis counseling for students, parents and staff *School Threat Assessment Team *Conducts classroom guidance lessons *Character Ed Shows *Co-Responsible for DCF concerns or questions *Bully Prevention *MTSS team *Health/Sanford Harmony facilitator *Monitor and support SEL for students and staff *Supervision duty *Other duties as assigned by the principal
Kirkland, Valerie	Other	*MTSS lead *Class and student data for MTSS *Support and Monitor ELL students *Assist in classrooms for ELL support as needed *Organize Translation support as needed *ADDitions- co-lead *Calendar co-lead *Assist with discipline support as needed *Other duties as assigned by the principal

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/15/2008, Korey Bawden

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	[LaShawn Russ-Porterfield](#)

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	45	114	101	123	113	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	612
Attendance below 90 percent	2	12	9	8	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/7/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	115	101	122	109	121	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	706
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	1	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	115	101	122	109	121	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	706
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	1	5	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	85%	57%	57%	80%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	76%	58%	58%	69%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	52%	53%	56%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	85%	63%	63%	76%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	61%	62%	64%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	70%	48%	51%	46%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	80%	56%	53%	68%	50%	51%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey						
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**						**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	55%	31%	58%	28%
	2018	82%	55%	27%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	57%	27%	58%	26%
	2018	79%	54%	25%	56%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	85%	54%	31%	56%	29%
	2018	83%	55%	28%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	62%	23%	62%	23%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison	-1%					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	63%	24%	64%	23%
	2018	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison	8%					
Cohort Comparison	1%					
05	2019	84%	57%	27%	60%	24%
	2018	82%	59%	23%	61%	21%
Same Grade Comparison	2%					
Cohort Comparison	5%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	54%	25%	53%	26%
	2018	74%	53%	21%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison	5%					
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	28	43	31	38	65	65	50				
ELL	73	82	71	83	79	76	47				
ASN	79	86		91	100		93				
BLK	79	58	45	73	50	42	55				
HSP	77	73	76	78	77	77	62				
WHT	91	78	59	89	74	69	91				
FRL	71	61	45	70	70	66	64				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	44	43	26	35	17	27				
ELL	65	66	65	74	72	60					
ASN	87	72		95	83		88				
BLK	70	57	40	63	50	23	53				
HSP	76	67	44	78	69	55	60				
WHT	87	69	61	87	70	48	82				
FRL	72	65	52	69	60	46	58				

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	39	52	38	31	33	20	36				
ELL	51	48	50	57	63	67					
ASN	81	58		92	77		90				
BLK	78	78	69	48	48	38	50				
HSP	69	60	39	66	51	43	55				
WHT	85	74	65	82	69	54	72				
FRL	69	61	51	56	55	44	39				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	600
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	72
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	90
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	74
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	64
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Based on the 2019 FSA data, ELA Lowest 25% had the lowest performance. However, this area still gained 8 points compared to the prior year. The available 19-20 school data continued to show similar numbers to 2019 state data. The two contributing factors continue to be students receiving ESE services and ELL students. Through analysis of ELA Lowest 25%, students with disabilities is a very specific sub group needing improvement.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

All data components showed increases in 2019. In reviewing the 2019-2020 data, all data components exhibited similar results.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

For 2019, all data components were above the state average. Initiatives put in place in 2019 will be continued for 2020-2021.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math Lowest 25% learning gain experienced the greatest improvement with a 25% gain according to the last available state testing data. Grade levels utilized a wide variety of resources and worked together in PLCs to fully understand the state math standards at higher levels. Also, additional instructional personnel supported the implementation of math lesson plans and provided remediation for students.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Based on the EWS, Level 1 Statewide assessment data is an area of concern. Students retained (all parent requests) will have multiple intense remediation pieces along with regular meetings with parents to monitor. Current programs and monitoring pieces will remain in place to support students who have any EWS indicators while better using the skills learned from cultural responsiveness to increase student achievement.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains
2. Students with disabilities
3. Black student Achievement in ELA and Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Analysis of the most recent state data from 2019 indicates ELA as an area of opportunity to increase learning for all students. For a continued growth mindset, focus on ELA and development of teacher expertise for ELA instruction will support increasing proficiency in ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase students on grade level in ELA by 3% from the 2019 state data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Daniels (christopher.daniels@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide intensive, differentiated instruction to all students based on reading standards and foundational reading skills as needed. The development of differentiated-rich instruction will be monitored within PLC planning of English Language Arts, team lesson plans quarterly and teacher observations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers are needing to match the intensity of instruction to the level of the student's learning and behavioral needs. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success. Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and receive immediate, corrective feedback with teachers and peers to practice what they are learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development will be provided at least three times this year through the PLCs for the additional ELA interventions and instructional skills. This professional development will provide new skills for teachers to enhance differentiation in both small and whole group instruction.

Person Responsible	Susan Honis (susan.honis@ocps.net)

Embed Minority Achievement Office (MAO) Cultural Responsiveness initiatives to support instructional practices for ELA to include acceleration during the FBS designated time within the school day.

Person Responsible	Felecia Goodman (felecia.goodman@ocps.net)

Professional Development will be provided to all instructional staff for the Marzano Design Question 3 referring to deepening knowledge. This is expected to increase knowledge, understanding, and intentionality of planning for activities fostering development in critical thinking and synthesizing information. We will use school Marzano data, data from observations, and one to one coaching meetings to monitor and increase teacher expertise.

Person Responsible	Christopher Daniels (christopher.daniels@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In analysis of the last available state data and current district data, students with disabilities continue to experience the smallest amount of gain in ELA proficiency. Through analysis of data, this sub-group of students continues to be a specific area to target for improvement.
Measurable Outcome:	Percentage of students with disabilities reaching grade level performance and learning gains will increase by 4% compared to the 2019 performance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Daniels (christopher.daniels@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Building up our system of how we analyze data, inform instructional practices, and make necessary adjustments that improve student outcomes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collecting and analyzing ELA data for students can lead to appropriate reteaching of standards to ensure academic progress and growth for all students. After all instructional teachers develop instructional goals, they should evaluate data and make the necessary adjustments to the students' instructional programs. Once instruction and other supports are designed and implemented, all teachers will have the skills to manage and engage in ongoing data collection using assessments and observations of student academic performance. They will also conduct self assessments of classroom instruction and discuss with key stakeholders (i.e., students, families, other professionals). Teachers study their practice to improve student learning, validate reasoned hypotheses about salient instructional features and enhance instructional decision making.

Action Steps to Implement

Leadership staff will provide professional development to instructional staff on analysis of data, district Literacy PLC strategies, and utilization of additional curriculum supports.

Person Responsible	Susan Honis (susan.honis@ocps.net)

The leadership team will monitor teacher progress toward building capacity in data-informed practices by reviewing PLC content and attendance monthly, conduct data chats and observe teachers with actionable feedback at least three times per year.

Person Responsible	Christopher Daniels (christopher.daniels@ocps.net)

Teachers will utilize the ELA data and effectiveness of strategies to make informed instructional decisions for the students bi-monthly in grade level PLCs with administrative and coach support.

Person Responsible	Christopher Daniels (christopher.daniels@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will focus on improvement with attendance.
Measurable Outcome:	It is expected that there will be improvement in the Early Warning Systems data in the area of student attendance.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christopher Daniels (christopher.daniels@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use distributive leadership and social emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, school environment observations and EWS data. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement strategies for social and emotional learning from Sanford Harmony and district provided professional development with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture. Monitoring will take place in classroom observations and guidance data.

Person Responsible	Jane Miller (jane.miller@ocps.net)

Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics, social and emotional learning as provided by the SELL team quarterly. Implementations of these strategies will be monitored through sign in sheets and grade level PLC notes.

Person Responsible	Jane Miller (jane.miller@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Achievement for ELL students and Black students will be an additional point of analysis as the other areas of focus are addressed. School leadership will continue to closely monitor the growth of these specific sub groups as evidenced in PLC planning for instruction and intervention. Additional analysis of formative assessments and classroom performance will be reviewed and monitored.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, all schools engage in ongoing, district-wide professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, schools use social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, schools across the district use the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teacher and administrators from each school, which includes a mental health designee, attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determination next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Schools utilize staff such as Parent Engagement Liaisons to bridge the community and school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.